August 9, 1966

923A Fulton St.
San Francisco, Cal.
94117

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

First, let me begin by thanking you for the many fine words you've expressed not only in personal letters to me but also in replies to others. They only make me feel very strongly about the worth of this entire matter and of the efforts of dedicated people like yourself who are interested in determining the truth no matter where it may lead. I cannot thank you enough.

Second, I must say that your prompt replies to my letters and the length of them have made me feel somewhat guilty for I had intended to write you much, much sooner than this. I wanted to bring your attention to a whole range of matters that I feel are of importance relating to this matter before this letter I am now writing but since the passage of time I may have forgotten some of them. I will try to mention a few things in the subsequent paragraphs.

I will begin by referring to your book and what I believe is an incorrect word used in the text. Turn to page 181 and note that in the second paragraph (the fourth line down) you use the word "exit". This should be "entrance" if one is to properly interpret your intention in describing the autopsy version of Humes. Otherwise, the use of the word "exit" would make no sense since the Warren Commission does not ascribe the bullet wound in the back as an exit wound but as an entrance wound. This may confuse your readers if the error is not corrected in future editions.

In your letter previous to the August 1 letter (dated July 16) you asked whether I or Ray Marcus had offered to lend or send a set of uncut Willis pictures of slides. I believe that it was most likely Ray who promised you them because I don't even have them and have never had access to them. I have seen copies of these that Dave Lifton has but I, myself, never possessed them. In any event, I asked Dave to get in touch with Ray Marcus and have them mailed to you. I presume that by now you have them.

Paul Hoch and I are going to meet tomorrow with a representative of the Committee of Inquiry to decide what future actions we may take to get public attention about the matter. If you have any suggestions on this I would certainly appreciate your views. Hoch told me he met you at the National Archives. Are you familiar with his work concerning the six different versions of Life Magazine (Oct.2, 1964)?

Joe Dolan never misses a chance to comment favorably about your book. I heard him one night and he said the book "will force a re-examination of the Warren Report". After your show and the appearance of Dave Lifton which I arranged, for weeks after people were calling in regarding the case. Most expressed their approval.

You asked for a copy of the tape of your show. Dolan said he would make a copy for me and one for you. He couldn't make two, however, and so he gave me one which I now have. I know I promised you a copy

and I do intend to send you one but I am very reluctant to send through the mail the only copy. I simply do not trust the Post Office and the possibility of it getting lost in transit seems very real to me. You can understand this when, in fact, I received a communication with some data on the case from a researcher and the envelope was ripped open. The contents were innocent enough but this appears to be a regular practice by the Post Office when they come across what they believe to be "sensitive" material. I do not think this to be a paranoic delusion on my part because others that I know of also tell me that their mail is opened up. In fact I know of an attorney here in the city who was asked to handle a law suit involving such practices some time ago. He decided, though, that it was not the time to do so.

So, as far as a tape is concerned I will have to have a copy made from the one Dolan gave me and then send this to you. It is not easy to locate someone with a tape recorder to do this for me but by this coming week-end I am going to make a determined effort to get one made and then forward you the copy. Try to bear with me in the meantime.

You asked if the Dolan show got any newspaper coverage. Unfortunately, it did not but this was more than likely due to their not knowing of the program in advance. I should have thought of this, though, although it is unlikely that any paper would have picked up on this <u>even</u> if I had notified them.

I wrote to Lifton and asked him to make sure he sent you copies of the Zapruder statements as you requested. I wasn't sure what you meant by this but I presume you are referring to a tape recording made by Roy Douglas and Barbara Bridges which Dave Lifton and I heard at Ramparts magazine. Dave probably mentioned this to you and I suggested in a letter to Dave that this is probably what you were referring to. Incidentally, I took extensive notes on this tape and this may be of interest to you regarding Zapruder's and others statements. Walter L. Winborn said he "saw some smoke out of the trees to the left". He also said he heard "three distinct shots" and saw one of the motorcycle policeman in the back of the president leap off the motorcycle and take off "on a direct line in direction of that smoke". Zapruder is quoted on this tape as saying "the police were running back behind me". Holland is also on this tape and he is quoted as saying:"The only proof that I have is the proof of the three or four more that was up there that saw the same thing that I saw." When Holland was asked to explain further he said "they asked me not to"(presumably referring to the Secret Service or the FBI who interviewed him). He did tell both Douglas and Bridges that if they were to return to interview him again he would tell them more. He added:"If you want to write a book we'll say on science fiction then I can paint you a pretty good picture". Dave seems to feel that this statement by Holland bears out his theory which you are familiar with.

I have copies of both Lane's book and Leo Sauvage. Sauvage is a reiteration of material he has already written about. I have not read either fully but Lane's is by far the superior.

You mentioned something about the location of Altgens and/or Lovelady being improperly placed on the chart prepared from the plat. I presume you are referring to Ray's chart which I have seen at his home but do not have in my possession. Dave feels the positions are accurately placed but I suggest you correspond with both on this.

Incidentally, with respect to Lovelady and his location. Lane in

his book has some information which I had not come across but vaguely remembered reading in the early part of 1964. He cites (page 355) a Herald Tribune article referred to in Volume XXII, 794 which describes Lovelady as wearing "a red and white striped sport shirt buttoned near the neck". This appears to be confirmed by an FBI interview of him to be found in the National Archives. If this is true it is unlike the clothing Oswald wore and unlike that seen in Altgens photo. In addition to this I have learned of someone in New York, I believe, has a photo of Lovelady taken on the same day he was wearing this shirt. His name is Ed Cohen. It is possible that Sylvia Meagher can get you his address should you want to reach him on this. Sylvia appears to know just about every person working on the case.

You mentioned rumors to the effect that publishers were trying to approach you. I have one suggestion on this. You might try Lyle Stuart, publisher of the Independent newspaper (N.Y.) and books of a controversial nature. He published "The Shark and the Sardines" and I know him fairly well. He is located in New York City at 239 Park Avenue South, New York 3, New York. He could be persuaded although early in 1964 when I asked him if he were interested in an article on Jack Ruby he told me he had no interest in the assassination. It is possible he could have changed his mind since then. I believe it is worth a try, anyway.

I ran into Ed Keating, publisher of Ramparts. I asked him when he thought the issue on the assassination was going to come out. He said it most likely would come out in December which would make it almost 6 months later than originally planned. He said they would adhere strictly to the anatomical and ballistics data and not go into other areas too deeply. The concentration will be on proving that more than one assassin killed the President.

I read the New York Times review of your book but it was only a single paragraph. It appeared to me that they weren't interested in giving you any publicity. It also occurred to me that they must have changed it before the final version was printed. I say this because you had ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ told me on the phone that the review which you had seen beforehand had contained certain words that did not appear in the version that sold on the news-stands. I think this is important to point out because it suggests censorship in some form. Was this the case?

For an accurate location of Willis, Lillian Castellano has developed proof to show that Willis slide #5 was snapped at frame 202, immediately after the first shot. The FBI, through Shaneyfelt, testified that the shot was taken at frame 210. This may be of some help to you. I also suggest you contact her to find out how she determined this.

You asked me to keep in confidence certain things such as a piece on Knebel's article in Look and a draft given to Bill O'Connell. I will of course, keep this in the utmost confidence. The fact of the matter is that I have not seen your analysis of the Knebel piece and I don't even know who Bill O'Connell is. (Who is he?). You can be assured though that I would not betray any confidence on any matter you would not wish me to discuss. On that I give you my absolute word.

Must get back to other matters now. I have more to discuss but this will have to wait. This letter should be enough of a "progress report" though. Hope you can reply soon.

Sincerely,
Hal Verb